

**REMARKS**

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**Claim Objection – Claim 50**

The Examiner has objected to claim 50.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 50 has been amended to overcome the objection.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart, Kramer**

The Examiner has rejected claims 33-36, 38, 40, 42-43, 45, 48, 50-52 and 54-58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,571,221 issued to Stewart (hereinafter "Stewart") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0099957 by Kramer (hereinafter "Kramer"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Stewart and Kramer.

(1) **Claim 33** pertains to an apparatus comprising:

*"an interface to at least one wired client device to receive **Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)** encrypted data and at least one wireless client device to receive **Wireless Transport Layer Security (WTLS)** encrypted data;*

*client-type determining logic to determine whether a client device requesting a connection is a wired client device or a wireless client device;*

*logic to perform a wired authentication to establish the secure connection when it is determined that the requesting client device is a wired client device;*

*logic to perform a wireless authentication to establish the secure connection when it is determined that the requesting client device is a wireless client device; and*

*logic to convert the **SSL** encrypted data to an unencrypted format and to convert the **WTLS** encrypted data an unencrypted format, wherein the conversions are based on a conversion indication received from the interface".*

Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious these limitations. In particular, Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious *“logic to convert the SSL encrypted data to an unencrypted format and to convert the WTLS encrypted data an unencrypted format”* in combination with the other limitations in the claim.

Stewart does not disclose or render obvious converting SSL and WTLS data to unencrypted formats. As shown in FIG. 1C of Stewart, a centralized network 130 preferably the Internet (see column 8, line 65) is disposed between the hybrid wired and wireless access point 124 and service provider 140. Applicants respectfully submit that Stewart would not convert encrypted data to unencrypted format in the hybrid wired and wireless access point 124, since this would compromise the end-to-end security for a transaction between the portable computing devices 110A/B and the service provider 140.

Kramer does not does not disclose or render obvious either *“an interface to at least one wired client device to receive Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encrypted data and at least one wireless client device to receive Wireless Transport Layer Security (WTLS) encrypted data”* or *“logic to convert the SSL encrypted data to an unencrypted format and to convert the WTLS encrypted data an unencrypted format”*.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that SS and KK do not disclose or render obvious *“wherein the conversions are based on a conversion indication received from the interface”*.

Accordingly, for at least one or more of these reasons, claim 33 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Kramer.

(2) **Claim 42** pertains to a method comprising:

*“receiving data within a data center from at least one wired client device and at least one wireless client device each requesting a secure connection with a server of the data center;*

*performing a wired authentication to establish the secure connection with the wired client device; and*

*performing a wireless authentication to establish the secure connection with the wireless client device; and*

*converting the data from an encrypted format to an unencrypted format based on a received conversion indication”.*

Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious these limitations. In particular, Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious: (a) “receiving data within a data center from at least one wired client device and at least one wireless client device each requesting a secure connection with a server of the data center”; and (b) “converting the data from an encrypted format to an unencrypted format based on a received conversion indication”.

As discussed above, Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious the claimed conversion of the data from an encrypted format to an unencrypted format based on a received conversion indication.

Furthermore, Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious receiving data within a data center from at least one wired client device and at least one wireless client device each requesting a secure connection with a server of the data center. As shown in FIG. 1C of Stewart, a centralized network 130 preferably the Internet (see column 8, line 65) is disposed between the hybrid wired and wireless access point 124 and service provider 140. Kramer doesn't remedy what is missing from Stewart.

Accordingly, for at least one or more of these reasons, claim 42 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Kramer.

(3) Claim 50 recites in part “converting the first encrypted data to a plain data format and to convert the second encrypted data to a plain data format based on a conversion indication received at the machine”. Accordingly, independent claim 50 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable for one or more reasons similar to those discussed above.

(4) **Claim 56** pertains to an apparatus comprising:

*"a network interface to receive Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) data from a wired device through a public network and Wireless Transport Layer Security (WTLS) data from a wireless device through a public network;*

*Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) logic to establish a secure connection with the wired device;*

*Wireless Public Key Infrastructure (WPKI) logic to establish a secure connection with the wireless device;*

*SSL logic to convert the SSL data to another format;*

*WTLS logic to convert the WTLS data to another format, wherein the conversions are based on a received conversion indication; and*

*a second interface to provide the data converted from the SSL and WTLS formats to a data center server over a private network".*

Stewart and Kramer do not disclose or render obvious these limitations. The discussion above is pertinent to this point. Accordingly, independent claim 56 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable for one or more reasons similar to those discussed above.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart, Kramer, Douglas**

The Examiner has rejected claims 37, 41, 44, 46 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Kramer and U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0010684 issued to Douglas.

As discussed above, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Kramer. At this point Applicants elect not to address the rejection of these dependent claims including the appropriateness or lack thereof of combining these references or other.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart, Kramer, Hajmiragha**

The Examiner has rejected claims 39 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Kramer and U.S. Patent No. 6,289,460 issued to Hajmiragha.

As discussed above, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Kramer. At this point Applicants elect not to address the rejection of these dependent claims including the appropriateness or lack thereof of combining these references or other.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart, Kramer, Stubblebine**

The Examiner has rejected claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Kramer and U.S. Patent No. 6,216,231 issued to Stubblebine.

As discussed above, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Kramer. At this point Applicants elect not to address the rejection of these dependent claims including the appropriateness or lack thereof of combining these references or other.

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****OCT 31 2007****Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

**Request For Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**Request For An Extension Of Time**

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

**Charge Our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10/31/07

By

Brent E. Vecchia

Brent E. Vecchia, Reg. No. 48,011

Tel.: (303) 740-1980 (Mountain Time)

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040

App. No. 10/045,893  
BEV/wlr

- 14 -

Dkt. No. 42P12318X